Vol. X, No. 26 **HUMAN EVENTS** July 1, 1953

JUL 9 '53

SMOG ALL AROUND THE CLOCK

By E. MERRILL ROOT

DR. J. B. MATTHEWS, the foremost expert on Communism in the country, had an article in *The American Mercury* for May, which should be read by every American who loves his country and who wants the truth. Dr. Matthews says: "If all the colleges and universities in the United States had been closed for the past thirty-five years, there is no reason to believe that our national situation would be any the worse, *insofar as an intelligent approach to the problem of Communism is concerned.* In fact, a case can be made for the argument that we should be in a much better position in this respect if they had been closed."

Dr. Matthews is so fully right. I unequivocally affirm that American colleges *in their relation to Communism* have been intellectual factories whose sole business has been the manufacture of smog.

In this pouring out of academic smog to cloud the nature of Communism, the few but potent Communists have been the unseen engineers and bosses, but the amorphous mass of naive, ignorant, complacent "liberals" have been the innumerable spade-men in overalls — willing dupes, gullible Robots, lulled by the mass hypnosis of the hour. And so long as this mass hypnosis continues, *the mechanical firing of every discoverable Communist in the country will not change the total situation for the better.*

Communism, the mailed fist, and collectivism, the moronic giant that swings the fist, since they first gained outward power in 1917, have grown more reactionary with every revolution of the clock, till today they are known by all free spirits to be indubitably the dead yesterday that men forgot to bury. Still, after all the experiences of three decades, the academic "liberals" go around like solemn morticians, embalming the corpse and setting it up as an Idol in the marketplace, before which all men must bow. This is not a question of "subversion" so much as a question mark after intelligence: dare we entrust our children to men so stupid?

Consider, in concrete and specific detail, some undeniable things that have happened in our colleges; and note how they reveal, inexorably, the secret "liberal" party line in these institutions.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On Thursday, February 19, 1953, the Amherst Smoker was held in the Roosevelt Hotel, New York City. There were two speakers — one doctrine. Both Al Friendly (of the *Washington Post*) and Professor Salmon of Amherst — what divine Providence arranges the gorgeous technicolor of nomenclature? — were in such intellectual agreement that the remarks of one seemed the page, and the remarks of the other, the carbon copy. They were, of course, "against Communism" — the preacher is always "against sin". Professor Salmon insisted several times that he is "a good capitalist". But having said this, they seemed to revel in opposing Communism without opposing Communism. The only thing we have to fear (they seemed to think) is "Soviet armed might" — and that is all "external"; internally, this side of the battlefield, the thing we have to fear — and we must fear it, for it is worse than Communism! — is Fascism.

And Fascism, in their quaint and devious thought, means committees on un-American activities, investigations of culture and colleges, and any attempt to distinguish treason from truth. Both speakers gave loud lip service to the external battle against Communism, but they really waxed lyrical against any attempt to combat infiltration, or any attempt to oppose the subtle destruction in the classroom of the mind to see, and the will to say, on which (and not on mere "external armed might") the Communists rely for victory.

What sort of opposition to Communism is this — which would fight it while it is far away, but coddle it when it is near at hand? Is the collegiate party line simply that we must send our young men to kill and be killed in Korea today and Europe tomorrow, while we, safe at home, sit down with the friends of our enemies, asking only that the blood on their hands be hidden by the kid gloves of "gentlemen and scholars"?

The only rebuttal to an indignant alumnus, like me, which the Alumni Secretary has (to my knowledge) offered is that there are two "respectable" points of view: (1) that armed might is the danger; (2) that infiltration and subversion are the danger. The speakers had a perfect right to choose *only one!* The Alumni Secretary seems never to wonder why both speakers should want to send all the doctors to Zanzibar, and then declare that smallpox is a form of health at home! Yet I for one remain curious why both speakers affirmed battle abroad and appeasement at home. If colleges are designed to "stir up thought" — an eternal platitude of these same "liberals" — why have only *one* side presented? Why not a spirited debate? Why not Professor Salmon salted with Dr. Matthews? Why not Al Friendly, with his partial emphasis, against Mrs. Bella Dodd, unfriendly to Communism whether at home or abroad?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Alumni Secretary justified the one-sided slant, I understand, because since the Smoker the Congressional Committee has been more fastidious in its procedures. To curb a Congressional committee seems, to the academic mind, more important than to curb Communism!

Other indications of the same trend toward smog, the same slanted propaganda, the same "liberal" party line, occur with marked frequency.

On April 23, 1953, the seventh annual Tau Kappa Alpha speech conference was held at Denver, Colorado. Students and faculty from colleges in Utah, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Texas, Alabama, etc., attended; it was a gathering of some of the outstanding speakers and debaters in many American colleges. One of my own students, Conrad Joyner, attended and won some of the highest honors.

Conrad Joyner is one of the splendid group of young radical conservatives who here and there challenge the dull orthodoxy of the day. Keen, experienced, richly gifted, he is sound and brilliant; his judgment is sober and reliable. In discussing the conference, he summed it up succinctly thus: "Several incidents occurred which disturbed me greatly."

One of the purposes of the annual conference is to discuss current problems and to suggest solutions. These, in the form of resolutions sponsored by Tau Kappa Alpha, are sent to Congress as an expression of collegiate opinion. One main topic this year was: "How can we effectively meet the threat of Communism?" The resolution formulated, accepted, and passed by a large majority, was — *to invalidate the Smith Act, the McCarran-Walter Act, and the Internal Security Act of 1950!* These outstanding students from American colleges all over the map could see only, as a way to combat Communism, the repeal and annulment of the defenses we have so painfully and too slowly built up against our most ruthless, militant and secret enemy!

To italicize their mood, a motion was passed to *"censure and reprimand"* Senator Joseph McCarthy for his alleged disregard of "responsible and intelligent speech". This resolution was passed by a vote of 103 to 6!

One student, from the University of Denver, publicly attacked the character of the maligned Senator. When told that he was engaging in "character assassination", he said: "So what? You can't assassinate McCarthy's character enough!"

How do students get that way? They get that way because of the intellectual climate, the psychological weather they find in the colleges which they attend. To prove my point, let me refer simply to what one of the professors present said when the resolution was passed: "I am tickled pink!" Conrad Joyner asked him: "Do you know the implications of what you say?" The professor replied: "I do. And I am not just 'liberal'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

— I am Left of liberal. I thought it the best thing I had ever seen done in a student assembly." Such are the sowers — and such the harvest.

THERE IS SMOG in Chicago, too. In the *Maroon,* the student paper of the University of Chicago (issue of January 9, 1953), a half page was filled with an advertisement entitled: "A Plea for Clemency". This was an eloquent and ardent appeal for the two Rosenbergs, who had been convicted by due process of law of being enemies of the United States and even traitors to the United States. They were finally executed on June 19. It is, of course, the constitutional right of the *Maroon* to publish such an appeal, and it is the constitutional right of the students and faculty of the University of Chicago to sign that appeal. That right I do not deny or question.

But granting that right to others, I claim the equal "unalienable" right to say that, in my judgment, such an appeal clearly documents an extreme point of view, far Left of center — a point of view emotionally sympathetic to Communism and to convicted enemies of the United States. If the students and faculty of a university so declare themselves, they must not object or deny when blunt lips say that they stand far Left and that they do not really oppose Communism. If they are not themselves Communists, as I judge they are not, I say that their stand is even more stupid and sinister than if they were.

And this petition was no gesture by a minority; no posture of a lunatic fringe. It was signed by the editor and managing editor of the *Maroon,* the President and Vice-President of the student government, and many individuals representing many organizations. It called for signatures to the petition and for attendance at a rally, the slogan of which was: "THEY MUST NOT DIE! RALLY to save the ROSENBERGS". This rally was to be a big university affair: it was to be presided over by associate professor of law Harry Kelvin, and its academic big gun, sponsoring it in huge type, was Dean Bernard Loomer of the Divinity School.

I do not question the right of Dean Loomer and his Praetorian Guard to their petition and their rally. Nor can they question my right to say that their petition and their rally make me faintly ill when I think of American boys tortured and "brain-washed" by the friends of the Rosenbergs in Korea.

Such then is the smog that drifts over the darkling academic plain where ignorant Leftists shout by night. One is moved, in his outraged soul, to utter a prayer: "O God of Freedom, blow Thy mighty breath over the world, and disperse this fog of man's perversion, and give us, again and at last, light and the unveiled sun!"

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 26 Wednesday, July 1, 1953 Washington, D. C.

JUL 9 '53 LIBRARY

Korea Policy: Some who initially backed the Administration policy of pulling out of Korea at any price are now blaming the Ike leadership for "botching the job". Many of these are members of Congress often termed "isolationist". They honestly believed that such an exodus from the Korean peninsula would prove simple and the problem of bringing the boys home of negligible importance. Now they have just discovered (for the first time) that Rhee's Korean army holds about two-thirds of the line and to try to pull out our boys without collaboration with Rhee might cause a military debacle. Such members of Congress wonder why the White House, State Department and Defense Services did not foresee the situation in which Rhee can call the tune. They wonder why — as do many along embassy row — the State Department did not first consult Rhee before going ahead with the truce on the terms so favorable to our enemies. If that had been done — they think — the truce would now be in force and a lot of the GIs would be headed home.

Others say that criticism of Ike is a bit unfair. Actually, as any experienced member of Congress knows, the Truman-Acheson holdovers run the State Department and there has been no change. These are the men who should have warned Eisenhower of pitfalls in the truce business, should have urged consultation with Rhee beforehand. But, eager freshman members ask, if that be true, why hasn't Dulles cleaned out the State Department? Verily, this is a time for recrimination.

It is a time, also, for credit for Taft and Knowland, who were critical of the State Department policy right along. Taft warned that it would be extremely difficult to bring about a real settlement in Korea and thought that we should not be hampered by the UN in the Far East. Knowland wanted the Administration to "show some spunk", to bargain "tough" with the Communists for a real peace. These leaders in Congress are now justified and many members of Congress concede as much.

World Strategy: Over the past weekend, two big events: (1) Churchill "took a rest", thereby probably putting to rest for some time his pet idea for a 4-power conference with the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, the Bermuda conference, scheduled as a preliminary to the meeting with Russia, is off. (2) Syngman Rhee apparently "laid down the law" to General Mark Clark and Mr. Dulles' envoy from the State Department. They evidently had to take it.

These two developments are partly the result of a struggle which has been widely misinterpreted. The struggle has not been between Rhee and Eisenhower; it has been between Rhee and Churchill. The British premier sold the truce idea and terms to Eisenhower and the State Department. State probably reassured Ike that Rhee would cause no trouble. Ike's role was passive. It was Churchill who pushed the matter. Rhee knew what had happened to the unfortunate Mikolajczyk, Polish premier, and Mikhailovitch, Yugoslav leader, whom Churchill sold out. Rhee was determined that he would not suffer the same fate. Hence his successful obstruction of the truce.

It would be surprising if Rhee has not also taken note of a parallel development of great importance — the revolt of the Germans in the Soviet zone of Germany. He could not fail to overlook the "kid glove" treatment which the Reds have given to the revolting Germans, attempting to allay their unrest. Rhee undoubtedly thinks that this is no time to conclude a deal (especially the kind of a deal desired by Churchill) with either the USSR or its satellites. Far better — it would seem to Rhee — to sit it out for a while and watch what might develop in Eastern Europe. It may even be that this prudent consideration occurred to Rhee's antagonist, Churchill — who found it preferable to "take a rest".

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip: The Capital is still chattering about the "case of the unexplained dinner", meaning the party given by the President a few weeks ago, which included Cardinal Spellman, General MacArthur, J. J. McCloy (former High Commissioner to Germany), and others. The function had no advance announcement and only a few details were released the day following by the White House.

We learn that the guests marvelled at one fact: although the Korea situation was obviously the concern of all minds at the time, not one word was said about it by the President. Mr. Eisenhower — as one guest put it — talked about every conceivable subject but Korea. The Cardinal sat at the President's right, General MacArthur at his left. Not a word about Korea passed between the three. The General left early, and the Cardinal accompanied him to the door, both expressing wonder that so little of importance was discussed.

Professional publicity men here offer a solution: that the affair was thought up by Jim Hagerty, the White House press officer; that it was designed to suggest to the country that Ike was consulting all these notables about the one subject interesting to all — Korea; that many people would conclude that Ike had the support of his Korea policy of such personalities as Cardinal Spellman and General MacArthur. Could be.

● According to confidential information just received from West Germany, the Conant administration of the U.S. affairs there is about as was expected when the Harvard President was named — that is, very bad. At a time when the East Germans, in virtual revolt against their Communist masters, need help and encouragement, the Conant administration devotes little time to that mission, but a lot of time to trying to persuade the Germans that Senator McCarthy is at the bottom of their troubles.

● Legal experts around the Capital laugh about Justice Jackson's inconsistency. Following the end of the war, in the Nuremberg trials, Jackson formulated the charges against the German leaders on an *ex post facto* basis, since the crimes which Jackson charged had not been legally punishable at the time the offenses were purportedly committed. However, two weeks ago, in the Rosenberg case, Jackson took just a contrary concept. The last move for a stay of the atomic spies death sentence was based on an atomic law of 1946, passed several years after the espionage acts were committed. Jackson took particular exception to this *ex post facto* angle.

Labor Story: It all depends on whose ox is gored. The text of this sermon is what happened in the State Department to Miss Edna Bess Stephenson, head of State's Foreign Journalists Liaison Unit, when she collided with some vested interests.

Miss Stephenson wrote a memorandum on the Taft-Hartley Act for the guidance and information of visiting foreign newspapermen. When a copy reached the hands of the CIO and AFL functionaries here, they lambasted it as a "shockingly anti-labor analysis" and "an amazing anti-labor analysis". We have been unable to obtain a copy of the offending document, but others who have seen it describe it as a fair statement which probably drew the wrath of the union bosses by its debunking of the term "slave labor law" as applied to the Taft-Hartley Act.

The tumult set up by the labor crowd was such that, on June 24, Miss Stephenson was suspended by the State Department, or put on "forced annual leave", pending consideration of further penalty. She is charged with violating a rule requiring proper clearance of material for release. Miss Stephenson, a former Ft. Worth, Texas, newspaperwoman, admits violating the rule but thinks her memo was "eminently justified". It is notable that no "committees for the defense of" have made the welkin ring in her defense, no "book burning" uproar has ensued.

Indeed, any dispassionate observer of the Washington scene must marvel at the contrast of spectacle. Sen. McCarthy is daily torn to pieces in a large part of the press, as a result of his efforts to expose the reds in Government. Time after time, when Joe "gets his man", and the fellow is either ousted or threatened with dismissal, reams of copy pour out to defend him and make him out as a martyr. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when Miss Stephenson seeks to correct the extravagences of labor union terminology for the enlightenment of visiting foreigners, the heads of the labor pressure group demand her scalp and get it promptly, with no protests audible. By the way, is this a Republican Administration?

Electoral Reform: Senator Karl Mundt (R., S.D.), this week came out for the Coudert amendment for reform of the Presidential electoral system and assumed joint sponsorship for the measure. Thus this attempt at reform (which we described in our issue of December 10, 1952, "Electoral Reform — The Coudert Amendment" by J. Harvie Williams) is advanced a step further, offering a method of reducing the present predominant power of the big-city states in the national elections every four years.

Mundt introduced the Joint Resolution to the Senate with remarks of a frankly realistic character, quite unlike much of the discussion which usually envelops the subject of electoral reform in a thick, academic cloud. As Mundt briefly put it:

"We recommend a constitutional amendment which will change the basis on which our Presidential electors are chosen at election time, from the general, state-wide, one-unit system now in vogue to one which will provide that our Presidential electors shall be elected in the same manner and in the same number as the Senators and Representatives of each of our several states. . . .

"The election-by-districts rather than the state-wide election system for choosing Presidential electors would give each voter in this country an opportunity to vote for three Presidential electors (one from his congressional district; two from the state at large), so each voter would have substantially the same 'vote authority' on election day; under our present system the voter in Delaware, for example, now votes for three Presidential electors, whereas the voter in New York state votes for 45 Presidential electors. Thus, each individual voter in New York state, due to the provisions of our present electoral system, packs fifteen times the power into his individual ballot compared with the individual voter in the state of Delaware.

"In varying degrees, the citizen who votes for President in all of our smaller states is a 'second-class' voter compared with the individual citizen in our larger states; and in no other state does the voter 'pack the punch' or have the authority or exercise the influence as the individual voter in the state of New York." This, as well as other evils, Mundt said his Joint Resolution would remedy.

The Senator also drew notice to the fact that a Committee to Study Electoral Reform has been created by the American Good Government Society which has its National Headquarters here in Washington at 1624 Eye Street, N.W. This special Committee plans to study this as well as the several other proposals now before the Senate and House. Those desiring further factual data on the subject can secure it by writing to the Society.

Money Making: The Federal Reserve System — presumably a banking institution, but virtually a fiduciary agent for the United States Treasury — last week reduced the reserve requirements of the country's banks. It is estimated that this order will release to the banks about $1,100,000,000 of their depositors' cash, which will in turn increase their lending power by nearly $6,000,000,000.

The banks will have no trouble in finding borrowers; witness the rise in interest rates these past few months. However, it so happens that the Treasury will have to borrow $6,000,000,000 against its expected tax collections, due in March, having already spent the money. So, in effect the System ordered the banks to "create" new money with which to buy the government's paper.

In due time this new money (or purchasing power) will be added to the country's purchasing power that has been on the increase since Mr. Roosevelt began the process in 1934 when he released money from the "shackles of gold". The government will pay out the money for this, that or the other thing, and eventually the nation's housewives will get all of it. And the housewives will do what they always do; they will bid up the prices of groceries and nylon stockings. What then? Well, in 1934 when the process of "legal counterfeiting" began, a ham sandwich, with mustard, cost fifteen cents. What do you pay for the same edible now? Before the price goes to a dollar, you may be asked to pay extra for mustard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The inflationary character of this latest move has already shown itself in the rise of government bonds. Immediately on release of the System's order, some of the issues which had fallen below par jumped back again. The financial institutions, which are very sensitive to fluctuations in the value of money, realized what was in the wind and bought up government bonds at 100 in expectation that this newly created purchasing power would push their value still higher. It will take a little time before the System's order gets around to raising the price of sandwiches.

The order to inflate came just at the time when the Administration was badgering Congress because of its (1) cuts in appropriations and (2) its intention to let the Excess Profits Tax law expire. The expiration of that law would cost the Treasury about $800,000,000 — or hardly enough to meet the interest on the public debt for two months; and the loss would probably be less than that, if one takes into consideration the increased taxable profits of the corporations resulting from their having this additional capital to work with. As for cutting appropriations, the Administration cannot see it for dust; when a government has less money it has less power, and no government is in business to give up power.

The order of the Federal Reserve System underlines the fact that the country is gradually learning; namely, that in fiscal matters, at any rate, there has been little change in the Washington "mess".

Pegler: It has always seemed to us that Barney Baruch was a very much over-publicized and over-rated fellow. Therefore, we rejoiced to find that Westbrook Pegler, the national newspaper columnist, paid his respects to the "elder statesman" (as well as to Henry Luce, the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and the labor barons) in a speech given to the National Editorial Association convention in New Orleans on April 26, 1953.

Said Peg: "One of the popular myths which we have propagated for years concerns Bernard M. Baruch. The ground hog is no more artificial. The daily newspapers and, I dare say, the press associations, have built up a cliché to the effect that Mr. Baruch is an elder statesman and an advisor of Presidents. Now, Mr. Baruch is elderly, to be sure; and he has had the ear of three Democratic presidents who got us into three terrible wars. But none of those who call him 'advisor of presidents' ever has backed up that reputation with a single item of proof. What advice did he give them?

"As to his statesmanship, I am not at all unfriendly, but I am reasonably skeptical, as all intelligent persons should be in secular matters. Is there an editor or publisher who does not know that for many years the late General Hugh Johnson wrote statements and speeches for Baruch? And that, meanwhile, Herbie Swope, late editor of the New York *World*, has been the intimate counsellor of this advisor of presidents? It has often seemed to me that this elder statesman's pontifications on world affairs were *dicta* distilled from current editorials and selected commentaries of cosmic columnists.

"Mr. Baruch undoubtedly does enjoy currently the friendship of President Eisenhower and Winston Churchill. I am not profane when I pray to God that he will not give Ike the sort of advice that he seems to have given Wilson, Roosevelt and Truman. As to Churchill, I bear in mind that he is not a personal spendthrift, that Baruch puts him up in his house on Fifth Avenue and that Baruch keeps a very fine cellar."

Peg winds up his epitaph on this "elder statesman" by noting Baruch's avoidance of a responsible government job. While Baruch did occupy a government position in World War I, he certainly appears to have kept sedulously away from such spots in recent decades. Hence Peg's finale: "As Lord Byron, the singing umpire of the National League, used to chant when batters hollered about *called* strikes, 'You can't get a hit with your bat on your shoulder' — but you can run up a synthetic reputation in our great American press without even taking a turn *at bat*."

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED